

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 03-4726**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

RANDY D. GLENN,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Spartanburg. Margaret B. Seymour, District Judge. (CR-02-1135)

---

Submitted: August 18, 2004

Decided: August 31, 2004

---

Before TRAXLER, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

J. Falkner Wilkes, CRAVEN & WILKES, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellant. J. Strom Thurmond, Jr., United States Attorney, E. Jean Howard, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Randy D. Glenn appeals his convictions after a jury trial of one count of armed bank robbery, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2113(a), (d) (2000), and one count of using a firearm in relation to a crime of violence, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 924(c)(1)(A) (2000). We affirm.

Glenn argues that the district court erred in denying his motions for judgment of acquittal because the evidence was insufficient to support the jury's verdict. A jury's verdict must be upheld on appeal if there is substantial evidence in the record to support it. Glasser v. United States, 315 U.S. 60, 80 (1942). In determining whether the evidence in the record is substantial, this court views the evidence in the light most favorable to the government, and inquires whether there is evidence that a reasonable finder of fact could accept as adequate and sufficient to support a conclusion of a defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. United States v. Burgos, 94 F.3d 849, 862 (4th Cir. 1996) (en banc). In evaluating the sufficiency of the evidence, this court does not review the credibility of the witnesses and assumes that the jury resolved all contradictions in the testimony in favor of the government. United States v. Romer, 148 F.3d 359, 364 (4th Cir. 1998).

Glenn does not contest the fact that the robbery in question occurred, or the particulars of the crime. He argues

that, because there was no physical evidence seized to connect him to the crime and no witness identified him as the robber, the evidence is insufficient to sustain his conviction. Our review of the record convinces us that the evidence, though circumstantial, clearly supported the jury's verdict.

Accordingly, we affirm Glenn's convictions and sentence. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED